

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 13 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

In the Office Action, Figure 1 has been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because it fails to show descriptive labels as described in the specification. Applicant has enclosed proposed drawing changes in the form of red-inked originals. The drawings have been corrected to include descriptive labels. As a result, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the proposed drawing changes. A separate letter will be sent to the Draftsman.

Claims 1-7 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (APA) in view of Song et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0000758 ("Song"). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over any combination of the APA and Song.

To establish a **prima facie** case of **obviousness**, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' Specification discloses a power delivery system including a battery source coupled to a computer system. See Applicants' Figure 1 and Specification at paragraph 12. However, there is no disclosure of a current limiter coupled to the battery, a

super capacitor (SC) or the computer system to prevent excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC.

Song discloses an electronic switch that can replace a standard mechanical light switch for 110-240 volt alternating-current (A.C.) devices. A triac switches the A.C. current to an A.C. device such as a light. A rectifier bridge generates a direct-current (D.C.) voltage that is applied to a special current limiter. The current limiter generates a large current peak at low voltages, but limits current at high voltages. The large current peak from the special current limiter charges a capacitor when voltage is low at the beginning of each A.C. half-cycle, before the triac turns on. The capacitor has enough charge to supply D.C. current to an Infrared detector and trigger control logic for the rest of the A.C. half-cycle. When the detector detects a person nearby, it signals the trigger control logic. The D.C. voltage from the rectifier bridge is filtered to generate a sync pulse to the trigger control logic when adds a phase delay to the sync pulse which triggers the triac. See Song at Abstract. Nevertheless, Song does not disclose or suggest a current limiter to prevent excess current from flowing from a battery to a SC.

Claim 1 recites a current limiter coupled to a battery, a SC and a computer system to prevent excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC. As discussed above neither the APA nor Song disclose or suggest such a limitation. Although Song discloses a current limiter, the function of the current limiter is to generate a large current peak at low voltages, but limit current at high voltages. Therefore, the current limiter in Song serves a completely different function than the current limiter recited in claim 1.

Since neither the APA nor Song disclose or suggest a current limiter coupled to a battery, a SC and a computer system to prevent excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC, any combination of the APA and Song would also not disclose or suggest such a limitation. It is also respectfully submitted that the APA does not teach or suggest a combination with Song and that Song does not teach or suggest a combination with the APA.

It would be impermissible hindsight based on applicant's own disclosure to incorporate the electronic switch disclosed in Song into the power delivery system disclosed in the APA. Moreover, such a combination would still lack a current limiter coupled to a battery, a SC and a computer system to prevent excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC. Consequently, applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over any combination of the APA and Song.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, claims 2-10 are also patentable over the APA in view of Song.

Claim 11 recites a current limiter coupled to a battery, a SC and a power delivery system to prevent excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 11 is also patentable over the APA in view of Song. Because claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and include additional limitations, claims 12-14 are also patentable over the APA in view of Song.

Claim 15 recites a current limiter to prevent excess current from flowing from a battery to a SC. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 15 is also patentable over the APA in view of Song. Since claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and include additional limitations, claims 16-18 are also patentable over the APA in view of Song.

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Song et al., and further in view of Smith et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,868,826 ("Smith"). In addition, claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Smith. Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over any combination of the APA, Song and Smith.

Smith discloses circuit modules for providing digital or analog outputs from computational devices in such a manner that the components of the output circuit modules are tolerant of malfunctions in one or more of the components. See Smith at Abstract. Nonetheless, Smith does not disclose or suggest a current limiter coupled to a battery, a SC

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made
Insertions are underlined, deletions are bracketed.

1 1. (Amended) A system comprising:
2 a battery;
3 a super-capacitor (SC) coupled in parallel to the battery;
4 a computer system coupled to the battery and the SC; and
5 a current limiter, coupled to the battery, the SC and the computer system,[that] to
6 prevent [prevents] excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC.

1 3. (Amended) The system of claim 1 wherein the SC prevents transients from the
2 computer system from affecting the battery voltage.

1 4. (Amended) The system of claim 3 wherein the SC has a capacitance of 20
2 farad and a resistance of 5 m .

1 11. (Amended) A system comprising:
2 a battery;
3 a super-capacitor (SC) coupled in parallel to the battery;
4 a power delivery system coupled to the battery and the SC; and
5 a current limiter, coupled to the battery, the SC and the power delivery system,[
6 that] to prevent [prevents] excess current from flowing from the battery to the SC.

1 13. (Amended) The system of claim 11 wherein the SC prevents transients from
2 the computer system from affecting the battery voltage.